DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 370 372 FL 022 121

AUTHOR Brock, Mark N.
TITLE Reflections on Change: Implementing the Process Approach in Hong Kong.
PUB DATE Mar 94
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (28th, Baltimore, MD, March 8-12, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; Classroom Techniques; *Educational Change; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; *Instructional Innovation; *Resistance to Change; Secondary Education; Teacher Attitudes; *Writing Instruction; Writing Processes
IDENTIFIERS *Hong Kong; *Process Approach (Writing)

ABSTRACT

The process of change and the resistance to change experienced by teachers and students during implementation of a new instructional approach is examined. The specific situation described is implementation of a process-oriented approach to writing in English as a Second Language, as experienced by eight Hong Kong secondary school teachers and their students and reflected in the teachers' diary entries during three lesson cycles. All teachers participated voluntarily. In writing diary entries, the teachers were guided by a set of questions designed to aid in describing and reflecting critically on what occurred in the classroom. Analysis of the diaries addressed the following: the topics most frequently addressed (pedagogical, evaluative, subject, or role focus); development of teachers' critical analysis; and changes over time in teaching or classroom outcomes. Results indicate that: (1) the focus of topics remained consistent over the three lesson cycles, but varied by individual teacher; (2) critical reflection increased for some and not for others; and (3) change over time varied by individual but was evident. Contains 7 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mark N. Brock
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Mark N. Brock

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 370 372

Reflections on Change:
Implementing the Process Approach in Hong Kong

Introduction

Every teacher brings to his or her classroom a set of attitudes about what constitutes effective teaching and learning. These attitudes have been shaped by experience, society, and the educational culture in which the teacher works. Without changes in the attitudes of teachers, innovation in classroom instruction cannot take place. Yet as research has indicated, attitudes are the one variable in the dynamic of curricular innovation least susceptible to change (Young and Lee 1987).

This paper will document the process of change and resistance to change of eight Hong Kong secondary school teachers as they implemented a process-oriented approach to the teaching of composition in one of their classes. Specifically, it will describe the experiences of these teachers and their students as reflected in diary entries made by the participating teachers during the three lesson cycles completed in the first six months of the two-year research project in which this research was carried out.

Background to the Study

In Hong Kong, the process approach to the teaching of composition, with its emphasis on meaning-making, collaboration, and revision across time, represents an innovation in classroom

FL022121

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

instruction. The process approach demands innovation, particularly in the role expectations it places on teachers and students - expectations radically different from the traditional expectations teachers and students bring to the Hong Kong secondary school classroom. In their research on teacher attitudes in Hong Kong, Young and Lee (1987) found that the dichotomy of transmission versus interpretation described well the differences in attitudes towards the teaching of English held by the ethnic Chinese teachers and the expatriate teachers they studied.

According to Young and Lee (1987:85)

> a transmission attitude is consonant with the teacher's role as a provider of information; it encourages students to contribute to classroom communication only through the presentation of a finished draft . . . and this attitude fosters an academic kind of learning which is not directly related to the learners' purposes and needs.

In the teaching of composition, this attitude most likely would result in a focus on correctness, defined solely by the teacher, of the written product. Such an approach most likely would take the form of compositions written on teacher-assigned topics, written at home, and handed in to be marked by the teacher with little or no collaboration with either classmates or the teacher.

An interpretation attitude, on the other hand,

> encourages a role for the teacher in which the learners' replies to the teacher's questions are treated as of value in their own right, and not simply as a function of whether they correspond to the teacher's view of correctness. The students are free to explore the subject in collaboration with other students and with the teacher without fear of the teacher's judgment in terms of right or wrong. And lastly,

> the interpretation attitude fosters a kind of learning which goes beyond the bounds of normal academic knowledge, and can be related to the students needs and interests outside school (Young and Lee 1987:85-86).

In the teaching of composition, this attitude most likely would result in a focus on the process of writing itself in which students first explore a topic, write drafts, receive feedback from classmates and the teacher, working throughout to make their meaning clearer. When marking, the teacher might evaluate more than the value of the final product, considering as well the process that led up to it.

In their study of Hong Kong primary and secondary school teachers of English participating in a government instituted training program in communicative approaches to language teaching in the 1980s, Young and Lee (1987:95) found that the attitudes of ethnic Chinese teachers in Hong Kong "vary around a norm which is far more highly transmission-oriented than the norm for teachers coming from a Western cultural background" and that these teachers showed little movement towards an interpretative orientation during the communicative language teaching training course in which they participated. While Young and Lee's study found resistance among Hong Kong teachers of English to the curricular innovations required for a more communicative-oriented approach to language teaching, a brief examination of the contemporary views of some educationists
towards that innovation will provide insight into the educational context in which the teachers participating in the project reported here attempted to implement a process-oriented approach to the teaching of composition.

According to recent reports in the English language press, some educationists in Hong Kong now view the introduction and innovation of a more communicative approach to language teaching as a failure resulting in a drastic fall in the English language standards of secondary school and tertiary level graduates during the past decade. Indeed, some officers in the Education Department itself now seem to have rejected the curricular changes they instituted in the 1980s. In an article published in the leading English-language newspaper in Hong Kong, the position of the Education Department was represented as one ascribing the perceived fall in English language standards to the relatively recent emphasis on communication in the classroom, claiming that

> part of the problem has been . . . with teachers' communicative approach to learning rather than teaching grammar rules (Cook 1994:15).

An interview with Mervyn Cheung Man-ping, Secretary of the Hong Kong Association for Continuing Education, published in the same issue of the newspaper, illustrates a widely-held bias against what is perceived as a Western approach to education. Mr. Cheung stated that the root of falling English standards lies in the

> wrong teaching approach in secondary schools over the past decade. 'Instead of teaching fundamental English like grammar and sentence structure, the approach emphasises creative learning' . . . Mr Cheung criticised the 'foreign approach' for not meeting the needs of Hong Kong students . . . Though the Education Department had abandoned the communicative approach, Mr. Cheung said 'harm has already been done' (Chu 1994:15).

These attitudes are widespread and illustrate some of the resistance that Hong Kong teachers face when attempting to institute curricular and pedagogical innovation.

The Study

The research project in which this study was carried out was one that provided supervised training for the participants for six months beginning in August 1992, followed by a free implementation phase lasting 18 months beginning in February 1993 and continuing through July 1994. The primary aim of the project was "to attain a deep understanding of the reactions which occur when the process approach is introduced on a limited and voluntary basis in the Hong Kong secondary school context" (Pennington 1992:9).

In the supervised training phase, the principal investigator of the project, Martha C. Pennington, a well-known researcher/teacher educator, and her research assistant, Marie Cheung, an experienced local secondary school teacher who had successfully implemented a process-oriented approach in her own composition classes, provided the eight participating teachers with:

- detailed instruction in the process approach,
- structured opportunities to discuss the approach and the participants' implementation of it,
- support and advice in implementing process-oriented activities in their classrooms,
- process-oriented teaching materials,

- feedback from researchers' observations of participants' teaching,
- and other guidance.

The comprehensive preparation and support provided the participating teachers was aimed at giving them every opportunity and as much support as possible to implement the changes in attitude and instruction this innovation to the teaching of composition required.

Data in this project were collected using a wide variety of instruments, including

- questionnaires on language teaching/learning attitudes,
- observation,
- evaluation forms,
- descriptions of teaching background,
- profiles of students characteristics,
- examination of lesson plans, and
- and analysis of teacher diaries.

This paper will focus on the written reflections teachers made in diaries kept during the first phase.

Eight teachers volunteered to participate in the project. Each of the participants was enroled in the final year of a MA-TESL program and each was preparing a thesis based on their experiences in implementing the process approach in their secondary school classrooms. The classes involved ranged from Form 1 to Form 6. During the first phase of the project, the

participating teachers wrote diary reflections after each composition lesson during three lesson cycles, each of which lasted approximately six weeks. After each cycle, the teachers' diaries were analyzed and coded using three coding categories adapted from Nunan (1991) and an additional category suggested by the analysis of the diary entries. At the feedback meetings held at the conclusion of each of the three lesson cycles, teachers received general feedback on their diary entries summarizing the topics represented in participants' diaries and similarities and differences among the diaries. They also received individual written responses highlighting prominent features of their diary entries and suggesting possible issues the teacher might wish to focus on in future diary entries.

In writing their diaries, teachers followed a set of questions (see Appendix A) designed to aid them in describing what occurred during a lesson and reflecting critically on the lesson. The primary purpose of requiring the participating teachers to write diary entries was to encourage them to reflect critically on their approach to teaching writing and on their implementation of the curricular changes required by the process approach.

The research questions the analysis of the diaries sought to answer included:

1. What topics were most frequently addressed in participants' diaries?
2. Did the diaries suggest that the participants' developed a more critical analysis of their teaching of

composition across time?

3. Did the diaries indicate any changes across time in the participants' teaching or classroom outcomes?

The Results

1. What topics were most frequently addressed in participants' diaries?

Analysis of topics addressed in participants' diaries resulted in individual "turns" being classified into one of four categories, within which were several sub-categories. A "turn" was considered opened when the writer introduced a topic and closed when that topic was closed or changed. The four categories included:

1. **Pedagogical Focus** in which the turn focused on, for example, instructional procedures, timing, and materials.
2. **Evaluative Focus** in which the turn focused on positive versus negative evaluation of, for example, instructional tasks and lessons.
3. **Subject Focus** in which the turn focused on students, self, or teachers in general.
4. **Role Focus** in which the turn focused on the role of students and/or teachers.

Sub-categories into which turns were coded for each of the four major categories included:

Pedagogical Focus -

- instructional procedures
- issue of time
- teaching materials
- use of L1
- classroom management
- issue of grammar

Evaluative Focus -

- lesson or instructional task
- planning
- use of time
- the process approach
- teaching materials
- teaching grammar
- use of L1
- classroom management

Subject Focus -

- student response to a lesson or task
- student performance in lesson or on task
- student behaviour
- teacher performance
- student motivation
- student language proficiency

Role Focus -

- role of students
- role of teachers

The following diary excerpts provide examples of each of the four coding categories:

Pedagogical Focus: "I explained the first question of each item to them one by one so that they knew what they were required to do in each item."

Evaluative Focus: "The lesson achieved process writing goals as students were able to write speedily and freely without obstructed by the form of the language."

Subject Focus: "They did not seem much motivated to finish the writing task."

Role Focus: "The teacher played the role of the observer in the lesson and tried not to interfere too much in their peer-reading activities, but rather allowed them more freedom to comment and discuss on each other draft."

The results of the coded diaries written for the three lesson-cycles are presented in Tables 1 through 5 below. Tables 1 through 3 present the frequencies and mean for both the topic categories and sub-categories into which participants' entries were classified. Table 4 presents a cumulative summary, by percentage, of turns classified in the four major categories across the three lesson cycles, while Table 5 provides a summary, by percentage, of the four topic categories for individual participants.

Cycle 1

Participants initiated more turns and nominated more topics in cycle 1 than in the following two cycles. Table 1 below shows the coding of categories and sub-categories for topics addressed in participants' diary entries as well as summaries of entries coded into the four categories.

Table 1
Frequency of Topic Categories and Sub-Categories in Cycle 1 Diary Entries

CATEGORY	SUB-CATEGORY	FREQ	MEAN	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8
PEDAGOGICAL FOCUS	Procedures	102	12.8	*12	*17	*25	8	3	11	*20	4
	Time	31	3.9	*5	3	*5	3	-	*8	*7	1
	Materials	21	2.6	1	-	*5	1	*3	*5	*3	*3
	Use of L1	13	1.6	*2	*4	*2	1	-	1	*2	1
	Classrm Mgt	6	.8	-	-	*6	-	-	-	-	-
	Grammar	6	.8	-	*1	-	*2	-	-	*4	-
	TOTAL	**179**	**22.4**	**21**	***25**	***43**	**15**	**6**	***25**	***36**	**9**
2 EVALUATIVE FOCUS	Task/Lesson	44	5.5	*10	4	*8	-	-	*13	*7	2
	Planning	19	2.4	1	2	*6	-	-	*3	*7	-
	Use of time	8	1.0	*2	-	1	-	-	-	*4	1
	Process Appr.	1	.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*1
	Materials	5	.6	-	-	-	-	-	*3	-	*2
	Tchg. Grammar	2	.3	-	-	-	*1	-	-	-	*1
	Use of L1	2	.3	-	-	-	*1	-	-	*1	-
	Classrm Mgt	1	.1	-	-	*1	-	-	-	-	-
	TOTAL	**82**	**10.3**	***13**	**6**	***16**	**2**	**0**	***19**	***19**	**7**
3 SUBJECT FOCUS	S Response	67	8.4	6	*9	*20	3	6	7	*13	1
	S Performance	37	4.6	*19	2	*10	1	-	-	1	4
	S Behaviour	30	3.8	2	*6	*14	2	3	1	-	2
	T Performance	20	2.5	-	*1	*11	*3	-	-	2	*3
	S Motivation	7	.9	*1	*2	-	*3	*1	-	-	-
	S Lg Proficncy	5	.6	-	*5	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TOTAL	**164**	**20.5**	***28**	***25**	***55**	**12**	**10**	**8**	**16**	**10**
4 ROLE FOCUS	Student Roles	17	2.1	1	*5	*5	-	-	-	*4	2
	Teacher Roles	7	.9	-	-	*3	-	-	-	*8	*1
	TOTAL	**25**	**3.0**	**1**	***5**	***8**	**-**	**-**	**-**	***8**	***3**
KEY: *=>MEAN	**GRAND TOTAL**	**450**	**56.3**	***63**	***61**	***122**	**29**	**16**	**52**	***79**	**29**

Of the 450 turns coded for the diary entries made during the first lesson cycle, 179, or 40%, focused on pedagogical concerns, 82 or 18%, on evaluative concerns, 164, or 36%, focused on either students or the teacher, and 25, or 6%, focused on the role of students or the teacher.

Cycle 2

Participants nominated fewer turns in cycle 2 than in the other two cycles. As Table 2 below illustrates, 384 turns were coded in the diary entries written during the second lesson cycle.

Table 2
Frequency of Topic Categories and Sub-Categories in Cycle 2 Diary Entries

CATEGORY	SUB-CATEGORY	FREQ	MEAN	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8
PEDAGOGICAL FOCUS	Procedures	88	11.0	*23	11	*15	8	3	5	*14	9
	Time	30	3.8	2	*8	3	1	1	*5	*8	2
	Materials	19	2.4	-	-	*7	2	2	-	-	*8
	Use of L1	5	.6	-	-	*4	1	-	-	-	-
	Classrm Mgt	15	1.9	-	-	*6	-	*2	-	-	*7
	Grammar	1	.1	-	*1	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TOTAL	**158**	**19.8**	***25**	***20**	***35**	**12**	**8**	**10**	***22**	***26**
2 EVALUATIVE FOCUS	Task/Lesson	34	4.3	*5	3	2	2	1	*7	*6	*8
	Planning	10	1.3	-	-	*5	-	-	*3	1	1
	Use of time	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Process Appr.	4	.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*4
	Materials	9	1.1	1	1	*2	*2	-	-	*2	1
	Tchg. Grammar	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Use of L1	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Classrm Mgt	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TOTAL	**57**	**7.1**	**6**	**4**	***9**	**4**	**1**	***10**	***9**	***14**
3 SUBJECT FOCUS	S Response	46	5.8	*6	3	5	5	3	4	*10	*10
	S Performance	72	9.0	*19	*20	*11	6	1	4	2	*9
	S Behaviour	24	3.0	*5	1	*9	*5	1	-	2	1
	T Performance	14	1.8	1	*2	*4	*2	-	1	1	*3
	S Motivation	19	1.3	*6	-	1	-	-	-	1	*2
	S Lg Proficncy	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TOTAL	**166**	**20.8**	***37**	***26**	***30**	**18**	**5**	**9**	**16**	***25**
4 ROLE FOCUS	Student Roles	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Teacher Roles	3	.4	-	*1	*1	-	-	-	-	*1
	TOTAL	**3**	**.4**	**-**	***1**	***1**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	***1**
KEY:*=>MEAN	**GRAND TOTAL**	**384**	**48.0**	***68**	***51**	***75**	**34**	**14**	**29**	***47**	***66**

Of the 384 turns coded for the diary entries made during the first lesson cycle, 158, or 41%, focused on pedagogical concerns, 57, or 15%, on evaluative concerns, 166, or 43%, focused on either students or the teacher, and 3, or 1%, focused on the role of students or the teacher.

Cycle 3

As Table 3 below illustrates, 396 turns were coded in the diary entries written during the third lesson cycle.

Table 3
Frequency of Topic Categories and Sub-Categories in Cycle 3 Diary Entries

CATEGORY	SUB-CATEGORY	FREQ	MEAN	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8
PEDAGOGICAL FOCUS	Procedures	110	13.8	*26	10	9	13	10	13	*15	*14
	Time	13	1.6	*2	-	-	*3	-	*2	-	*6
	Materials	17	2.1	*4	1	2	*3	2	-	1	*4
	Use of L1	8	1.0	*2	-	*2	*2	-	1	-	1
	Classrm Mgt	1	.1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
	Grammar	5	.6	-	*1	-	*3	-	-	-	*1
	TOTAL	**154**	**19.3**	***34**	**12**	**13**	***25**	**12**	**16**	**16**	***26**
2 EVALUATIVE FOCUS	Task/Lesson	46	5.8	2	-	3	*8	3	3	*14	*13
	Planning	12	1.5	1	-	*2	*2	-	*4	-	*3
	Use of time	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Process Appr.	7	.9	-	-	-	-	-	*1	*1	*5
	Materials	4	.5	-	-	-	*4	-	-	-	-
	Tchg. Grammar	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Use of L1	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Classrm Mgt	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TOTAL	**69**	**8.6**	**3**	**0**	**5**	***14**	**3**	**8**	***15**	***21**
3 SUBJECT FOCUS	S Response	53	6.6	*9	6	-	4	3	*7	*13	*11
	S Performance	54	6.8	*13	3	4	-	-	*13	*12	*9
	S Behaviour	24	3.0	2	2	*9	*6	-	-	*4	1
	T Performance	14	1.8	*2	-	*2	*3	-	-	*2	*5
	S Motivation	5	.6	-	-	-	*2	*1	-	-	*2
	S Lg Proficncy	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TOTAL	**150**	**18.8**	***26**	**11**	**15**	**15**	**4**	***20**	***31**	***28**
4 ROLE FOCUS	Student Roles	4	.5	-	-	-	-	-	*1	*2	*1
	Teacher Roles	19	2.9	*4	-	-	-	2	*3	*8	2
	TOTAL	**23**	**2.9**	***4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	***4**	***10**	***3**
KEY: *=>MEAN	**GRAND TOTAL**	**396**	**49.5**	***67**	**23**	**33**	***54**	**21**	***48**	***72**	***78**

Of the 396 turns coded for the diary entries made during the first lesson cycle, 154, or 39%, focused on pedagogical concerns, 69 or 17%, on evaluative concerns, 150, or 38%, focused on either students or the teacher, and 23, or 6%, focused on the role of students or the teacher.

Summary of Topics Coded in Diary Entries

As the summary of topic category percentages provided in Table 4 below shows, except for turns coded as having a role focus, the percentage of turns coded to each of the four categories remained largely unchanged from cycle 1 to cycle 3.

Table 4
Summary of Topic Categories Across Three Cycles by Percentage

Category	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3
PEDAGOGICAL FOCUS	40%	41%	39%
EVALUATIVE FOCUS	18%	15%	17%
SUBJECT FOCUS	36%	43%	38%
ROLE FOCUS	6%	1%	6%

There were, however, variations in topic percentages reflected in individual diary entries across the three lesson cycles. In Table 5 below the percentages of topic categories addressed in each participant's diary entries for each of the three cycles is given.

Table 5
Summary of Topic Categories for Each Diary by Percentage

Teacher No.			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
PED. FOCUS	(%)	Cycle 1	34	41	35	52	38	48	46	31
		2	37	39	47	35	57	34	47	39
		3	51	52	40	46	57	33	22	33
EVL. FOCUS	(%)	Cycle 1	21	10	13	7	0	37	24	24
		2	9	8	12	12	7	34	19	21
		3	4	0	15	26	14	17	21	27
SUB. FOCUS	(%)	Cycle 1	45	41	45	41	62	15	20	34
		2	54	51	40	53	36	31	34	38
		3	39	48	45	28	19	42	43	36
ROLE FOCUS	(%)	Cycle 1	0	8	7	0	0	0	10	11
		2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	2
		3	6	0	0	0	10	8	14	4
TOTAL ENTRIES CODED	(Freq)	Cycle 1	62	61	122	29	16	52	79	29
		2	68	51	75	34	14	29	47	66
		3	67	23	33	54	21	48	72	78

2. Did the diaries suggest that the participants' developed a more critical analysis of their teaching of composition across time?

As Ho and Richards (1993:9) note, "the mere fact of writing about teaching does not necessarily involve critical reflection, since teachers can write largely at a procedural level focusing on trivial details rather than underlying or deeper issues." The analysis of participants' diaries for this study found this to be partially true. For the majority of participants, however, there was evidence of critical reflection in many diary entries.

Bartlett (1990:205) defines critical reflectivity as the point at which teachers

> transcend the technicalities of teaching and think beyond the need to improve . . . instructional techniques. This effectively means . . . to move away from the 'how to'

> questions, which have a limited utilitarian value, to the 'what' and 'why' questions, which regard instructional and managerial techniques not as ends in themselves but as a part of broader educational purposes.

Bartlett's (1990) conception of the process of becoming a critically reflective teacher involves five parts: (1) mapping (describing what one does as a teacher); (2) informing (discussing the intensions and meaning of what one does as a teacher); (3) contesting (examining the process that led to the way one teaches); (4) appraisal (considering how one might teach differently); and (5) acting (deciding what and how one will now teach). As Ho and Richards (1993) have noted, in Bartlett's framework, mapping is primarily descriptive while the other four parts involve the critically reflective processes of evaluation, self-analysis, theory building and planning.

Of the four topic categories into which diary entries were coded in this study, those coded as having a pedagogical focus were exclusively descriptive, while those coded as having an evaluative or role focus were exclusively reflective. Turns coded as having a subject focus fell into either category depending on whether the entry simply described, for example, student performance on a task, or in some way diagnosed or examined more closely the reasons behind that performance. If the entry dealt with the "why" and the "what" of teaching, it was coded as reflective. If it simply described the "how to" of teaching, it was coded as descriptive.

The frequency of turns coded as evidencing critical reflection for each of the three cycles is shown in Table 6.

Table 6
Frequency of Turns Coded as Showing Critical Reflection

Cycle 1	Freq	Mean	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8
Evl. Focus	80	10.0	*13	6	*16	2	0	*19	*17	7
Sub. Focus	50	6.2	6	*12	*20	3	1	1	4	3
Role Focus	25	3.1	0	*5	*8	1	0	0	*8	3
Total	155	19.3	19	*23	*44	6	1	*20	*29	13
Cycle 2										
Evl. Focus	57	7.1	6	4	*9	4	1	*10	*9	*14
Sub. Focus	96	12.0	*24	*16	*19	4	1	5	8	*19
Role Focus	3	.4	0	*1	*1	0	0	0	0	*1
Total	156	19.5	*30	*21	*29	8	2	15	17	*34
Cycle 3										
Evl. Focus	59	7.4	3	0	5	4	3	*8	*15	*21
Sub. Focus	89	11.1	*15	7	10	5	1	*13	*20	*18
Role Focus	23	2.9	*4	0	0	0	2	*4	*10	*3
Total	171	21.4	*22	7	15	9	6	*25	*45	*42

Results of analyzing diaries for levels of critical reflectivity showed that participants on average made fewer turns coded as having an evaluative focus in diary entries written for cycle 2 and 3 than for cycle 1. Results indicate that participants made more critically reflective entries coded as having a subject focus in cycles 2 and 3 than in cycle 1. There were only three entries coded as having a role focus in cycle 2, whereas 25 entries in cycle 1 and 23 entries in cycle 3 were coded as having a role focus.

For individual participants, the results seem to confirm Ho and Richards (1993) findings that while teacher diaries provide opportunities for teachers to critically reflect on their teaching, they do not necessarily promote it across time. Of the eight participants, only one (T8) showed a dramatic increase from cycle 1 to cycle 3 in the number of diary entries coded as

showing critical reflectivity. For the other participants, the results were more mixed; however, only two participants (T4 and T5) made consistently few entries coded as showing critical reflectivity.

3. Did the diaries indicate any changes across time in the participants' teaching or classroom outcomes?

Of the three research questions asked in this project, the question regarding evidence of change is the most important yet most difficult to answer. There does seem to be some evidence, however, of perceptible changes in the focus of participants' entries across the three cycles. And it is obvious that, at least among some of the participants, there were reports of changes in attitude about the teaching of writing and the approach the teacher used in teaching writing. This seems particularly clear in cases of some participants' reporting definite shifts away from a more transmission mode of teaching writing towards a more interpretative mode.

Cycle 1

Entries made for cycle 1 were marked by a concern for procedural matters in implementing a process-oriented approach to the teaching of writing. In other words, teachers were concerned with the "nuts-and-bolts" of implementing what was for them and their students a radical change in classroom procedures in the teaching of composition. In cycle 1, three common issues concerning instructional procedures that teachers addressed in their diaries included timing of lesson activities, keeping

students on task, and managing small group activities. Entries written for cycle 1 were mostly descriptive in nature, reporting the procedures used in lessons and describing student and teacher performance on tasks.

In Cycle 1, three teachers wrote three or more turns in which they considered the role demands placed on students and teachers in a process-oriented classroom. Most of these entries were focused on student roles, and most reflected some expression of resistance among students to the "responsibilities" placed on them by the process approach. For example, in describing the response of students to reading their own compositions critically, teacher 2 wrote:

> The students found it hard to check their own draft because they expected it was the teacher's role doing all the checking. They did not like to take responsibility on their mistakes because they thought the teachers was an authority or dispenser of knowledge. They should feel pleased if everything is marked by the teacher.

Teacher 3 described well the concern felt by many of the teachers about changes in instructional procedures leading to problems in classroom management. In describing her first lesson involving a small group activity, teacher 3 wrote:

> It was a bit out of control in terms of the classroom management according to the usual practice in Hong Kong secondary school setting. It was noisier than usual. Some of the less motivated and less responsible students did not participate in the activities.

A final characteristic that marked in particular the entries of teacher 4 and teacher 5 was the discussion of environmental

constraints faced in implementing process-oriented activities. Among the constraints discussed were low language proficiency among students, student motivation, lack of time, discipline problems, and tendency of students to focus on grammatical concerns alone. Teacher 4 and teacher 5, both implementing the process approach in a lower form class, appeared to face the greatest resistance from students in implementing process-oriented activities. Teacher 4 mentioned lack of motivation among students three times and also expressed the belief that the focus of instruction for his group of learners should primarily be on "grammar," as he believed it to be the "weakest point" in their language proficiency. Teacher 5, on the other hand, spent a great deal of time dealing with discipline problems. For example, in one entry he wrote:

> As some time was spent on dealing with discipline problems the time used for explanation . . . was cut short.

This teacher also faced student resistance in revising their compositions, reporting that some students "did not want to rewrite their work," while "some just wanted to finish the task quickly and did not work seriously."

Cycle 2

While cycle 1 was marked by teacher and student struggles to adapt to process-oriented activities such as peer feedback sessions and small group discussion, cycle 2 was marked by a growing familiarity and level of comfort with those activities. In many of the entries, the participating teachers reported that

they and their students were more "comfortable" and more "confident" in the procedures they were following in implementing process writing activities. Teacher 1, for example, wrote that her students were much "more confident" in giving and receiving peer feedback on their compositions, while she described the lessons themselves as being much more "smooth" than in cycle 1. In cycle 1, teacher 1 mentioned the pressures of time at least 7 times in her entries, exhibiting a great deal of discomfort in how to structure activities and use lesson time in her process-oriented composition class. While she mentioned the issue of time twice in cycle 2, it was not to report feeling time pressures but simple to report how class time was used.

Teacher 6 also commented on how her students had become "used to" peer reading and peer discussion. Teacher 7 reported that both she and her students were "more comfortable" and "more aware" of the procedures used in this approach.

In his cycle 2 entries, teacher 4 focused on discipline problems. Both he and teacher 5 wrote only short descriptive sentences, providing little evidence of critical reflection on their teaching. Teacher 5 described the discipline problems in his class as improving. He reported that the two worst-behaved students had been expelled from school and that students seemed to have become used to the new style of instruction.

Of all the participants, teacher 8 reports the most change in both her and her students' performance and attitudes in class. She reported that in cycle 2 both she and her students were more relaxed and prepared for process writing; that students understood and accepted that writing takes time, and they need

to reflect on their writing; and that she had realized that rather than attempting to do everything in one step, the students would actually benefit from a more progressive approach. She also reported a willingness, even enthusiasm, among students to share their writing with their peers. "This," she reported, "was a great change as some of them guarded their own writing with great care before." Teacher 8 also reported a shift in her perception of her own role in the class. In a process-oriented classroom, she reported that her job

> becomes more of a monitor than a teacher. I listen and clarify . . . rather than tell what was right or wrong. On the whole . . . I become more student-centred.

Cycle 3

Cycle 3 was marked by reports among most of the participating teachers of an integration of the tenets and approaches of process writing and a discernible shift towards a more interpretative (as opposed to transmission) attitude and approach towards the teaching of writing. Teacher 1, for example, described the role she now believed she should take in the writing classroom as one of "consultant," "facilitator," and "coordinator." She also reported that her students were "gaining confidence in their ability to peer revise" and that they were "enjoying it."

Teacher 6 reported more personal enthusiasm and more enthusiasm among her students towards the process approach. She wrote that "students' good performance gave me more confidence in the approach." She also described viewing her role in the

classroom as one of "facilitator," "observer who tried not to interfere too much in their peer-reading activities," "supporter," and "manipulator to assist the students in the exploring of their own thoughts." Concerning student response, she reported that her students had

> adjusted quite well to this way of teaching and felt very comfortable and happy learning under this approach. Students believed in the merits of the approach and found it useful and helpful. They had become a supportive feedback community.

Teacher 7 reported that she and her students had "adapted successfully" to the new approach and described her role in the classroom variously as one of being a "facilitator," "mentor," and "stimulator."

Teacher 8 described lessons in cycle 3 as the "smoothest of all." Concerning changes in teacher and student roles, she wrote:

> We have changed our role from the traditional role of teacher/student. In the conference, I am more like a listener or facilitator whose job is to hear why they have expressed themselves in such a way. I have also soften up a bit and become . . . sympathetic and supportive.

She added that, "since I have adopted this process writing some have found me 'more human.'"

Not every diary reflects a successful adaptation to the attitudes and approaches common to process writing. Teacher 3, for example, seems to have abandoned using peer group activities in her composition classroom due to problems in student

behaviour. She reported that

> Learning from the previous lessons, a whole class instruction is better than pair work or group work. At least for the motivated students, they have more guidance from the teacher's direct instruction to the whole class. The naughty students are given less chances to play around as the teacher looks after the whole class rather than attends a pair or a group at a time during the lesson.

While teacher 4 reported "better participation" among his students and commented that lessons in cycle 3 were "smoother," the constraints he faced in implementing the process approach in his classroom was still a primary focus. Among constraints he listed were "behavioral problems," "low language proficiency," "the required textbook," and the need for more "grammar input." He also reported a reluctance to revise among many of his students who reported that revising was "boring."

Teacher 5, who wrote about a number of constraints on implementing the process approach in entries written for the previous two lesson cycles reported that classroom procedures were "smoother" and more routine in cycle 3. He also reported that students were responding "more enthusiastically." There also seemed to be at least a slight shift in his view of his role in the classroom as well. He reported that during this lesson cycle he walked around the classroom acting as an individual "counsellor" to help students "solve their problems and answer their questions." While the primary change seems to be that this teacher began walking around the classroom rather than remaining stationary at the front, his view of himself as a "counsellor" is evidence of at least a slight shift towards a more

interpretative approach to the teaching of composition.

While the major focus of diary entries written for first cycle lessons was on the description of procedural problems in implementing process writing and those written for cycle 2 on successful implementation of process writing activities, cycle 3 entries showed evidence of a shift towards utilizing the process approach as a way of meeting individual student needs. This shift is most clearly represented in the diary entries written by teacher 8 who writes at length on adapting a process-oriented approach as a way of individualizing instruction to meet students' specific needs. For example, rather than focusing the attention of the whole class on errors common to several compositions, she has adopted a new approach in dealing with student errors. She wrote:

> Their errors don't bother me as much as most of them managed to explain why such an error has been made. By having them to explain where the error is and why it is considered as an error I think the student can understand it much better and remember it later on.

She also reports how her focus on writing has become much more student-specific. She reported:

> I have noticed that it's very dangerous to generalize the problems students encounter in their writing.

Finally, she no longer sees her job as that of an editor.

> My job is not to pick up as many mistakes as I can find. My job is to help them to develop their ideas and present them in an organized manner.

This is clear evidence, I believe, of a shift not only in procedural approach, but in attitude as well. It is an attitude change that is allowing this teacher to see and respond to the individual problems of individual students.

Teacher 2 reported an attempt to meet individual student needs through pairing weaker students with stronger ones. This approach, which she dubbed the "one saves one campaign," was adopted so that peer reading at the editing stage would be "fruitful and effective" for students with weaker language proficiency.

Other evidence of a move towards individualizing instruction was reported in an entry written by teacher 7. She reported that students were "delighted" with the individual attention they received from her and from members of their peer feedback group. She also reported her attempts to stimulate student thinking processes to help students recognize their own mistakes.

Conclusion

While any conclusions drawn from the types of teacher diary data reported here must be tentative ones, there do appear to be grounds for supporting the supposition that teachers can change both their classroom practices and attitudes towards teaching under certain conditions. If, as in the project discussed here, teachers are supported at all stages in implementing curricular innovation, if they are thoroughly trained in that innovation, and if they are encouraged to reflect critically on their implementation of the innovation, there is opportunity for change to occur. Change, however, is not easy when teachers face

structural and environmental constraints such as large classes, public examination pressures, and cultural resistance. The results of this study do suggest, however, that even when teachers face structural and cultural resistance to an innovation they are seeking to implement, change can successfully occur when adequate support is provided.

Acknowledgement

This study was conducted with support provided by a Competitive Earmarked Research Grant (No. 904051) from the Hong Kong University & Polytechnic Grants Council. I would like to thank the Principal Investigator of the project, Dr. Martha C. Pennington, for her support and guidance in conducting this research.

References

Bartlett, L. (1990). Teacher development through reflective teaching. In J. C. Richards and D. Nunan (Eds.), Second Language Teacher Education (pp. 202-214). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chu, D. (1994). Cashing in after hours. The South China Morning Post, February 12.

Cook, B. (1994). The future hinges on questions of language. The South China Morning Post, February 12.

Ho, B. and Richards, J. C. (1993). Reflective thinking through teacher journal writing: Myths and realities. Perspectives, 5(2), 25-40.

Pennington, M. C. (1992). Implementing process writing in Hong Kong secondary schools: Towards a context-sensitive model of educational innovation. Competitive Earmarked Research Grant No. 904051. Hong Kong University & Polytechnic Grants Council.

Nunan, D. (1991). Teacher's interactive decision-making processes. Research Report to the Adult Migrant English Program. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University, Australia.

Young, R. and Lee, S. (1987). EFL curriculum innovation and teachers' attitudes. In R. Lord and H. N. L. Cheng (Eds.), Language Education in Hong Kong (pp. 83-97). Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.

Appendix A
Questions Teachers Considered in Writing Their Diaries

1. What lesson materials did you use and what adaptations (if any) did you make to these to fit the needs of your class? Please explain the reason(s) for any changes made.

2. During the lesson, did you depart from your lesson plan? If so, for what reason(s) and in what way?

3. Describe the type(s) of activities that took place in the class and how successful you think each of these was. Give reasons for the success or lack of success of each of these areas.

4. How did the students respond to the lesson?

5. Did any particular student(s) stand out in their behaviour during the lesson? If so, please describe their behaviour, its possible causes, and how you responded to it.

6. How would you describe your own performance in carrying out the lesson, and how do you feel about your performance?

7. What do you plan to do in the class to follow up on or to continue the work done in this lesson?